

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF  
PROPOSITION 10  
~~REBUTTAL TO YES ON PROP. 10 BALLOT ARGUMENT~~

Prop. 10 will cost taxpayers nearly \$10,000,000,000 in long-term debt. Money that won't go to schools, roads, health care or public safety. Money that could go primarily to one company owned by the sponsor of this initiative. That's not good public policy.

Proposition 10's money would give taxpayer subsidies up to \$50,000 each to buyers of trucks and other vehicles that run on a fossil fuel, natural gas. It is not about "alternative fuels."

Despite proponents' claims, Prop. 10 is craftily written to all but exclude hybrids, plug-in hybrids, electric cars and other clean fuels.

This well-concealed tilt to one fuel will chiefly benefit Proposition 10's sponsor, Texas oil billionaire T. Boone Pickens. His company is a major supplier of natural gas for vehicles.

Proponents' claims of cleaner air and accountability fail to tell you:

- Proposition 10 does not require any improvement in air quality, or any reduction in greenhouse gases.

# REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF

## PROPOSITION 10

- It does not require that industries getting tens of million in "clean energy" grants ever produce clean power.
- And it's unclear that Californians will even benefit from the millions in subsidies and grants they're paying for.

No guarantees. None.

Economists will also tell you that increasing demand for natural gas can indeed raise your utility rates.

During a budget crisis, we shouldn't be handing \$10 billion in taxpayer dollars to special interest gimmicks. Vote NO on Prop 10!

~~Signed:~~

Donna Gerber  
Director of Government Relations, California Nurses Association

Richard Holober  
Executive Director, Consumer Federation of California

Judy Dugan  
Research Director, Consumer Watchdog

**SUBJECT TO COURT  
ORDERED CHANGES**